



City of Carmel

Carmel Board of Zoning Appeals Regular Meeting Monday, April 23, 2007

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Carmel Board of Zoning Appeals met at 6:00 PM on Monday, April 23, 2007, in the Council Chambers of City Hall, Carmel, Indiana. The meeting opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Members in attendance were Kent Broach, Leo Dierckman and James Hawkins, thereby establishing a quorum. Angie Conn, Christine Barton-Holmes, Mike Hollibaugh and Rachel Boone represented the Department of Community Services. John Molitor, Legal Counsel, was also present.

Mr. Dierckman moved to approve the minutes of the March 26, 2007 meeting as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Broach and **APPROVED 3-0.**

Mrs. Conn gave the Department Report. She informed the Petitioners with only three Board members present, they have the option to table this month with the hopes that all five members will be present at the next meeting.

Mr. Molitor gave the Legal Report. In regard to the quorum issue, the one item that was on the Hearing Officer agenda and switched to the full Board will be continued until next month because one of the Board members has recused himself from that petition. He would like to request that the Board be available to schedule an Executive Session at the conclusion of next month's May 21st meeting at approximately 7:30 or 8:00 PM to discuss the pending litigation.

Mr. Hawkins asked if the Board needed to vote to move the item from the Hearing Officer agenda and then table it.

Mr. Molitor stated that would be a good idea to include the item in the agenda and then have a motion to continue it to next month to be heard by a quorum of the Board.

Mr. Dierckman asked if they could move it back to the Hearing Officer agenda, so the Petitioner did not have to go through the delay.

Mr. Molitor stated that once the Staff has removed it from the Hearing Officer's agenda, it is on the full Board's agenda.

Mr. Broach moved to move **Docket No. 07030030 V Monon & Main, Unit 3H** from the BZA Hearing Officer's agenda to the full Board agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dierckman and **APPROVED 3-0.**

Mr. Hawkins moved to Table **Docket No. 07030030 V Monon & Main, Unit 3H** until the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dierckman and **APPROVED 3-0.**

H. Public Hearing:

1-7h. Applegate Condominiums

The applicant seeks the following development standards variance and special use approvals:

Docket No. 07010002 V	Section 23D.03.C.3.k(ii)	maximum building height
Docket No. 07010003 V	Section 23D.03.C.3.f(i)	parking in front yard
Docket No. 07010004 V	Section 23D.03.C.3.i(i)	roof pitch
Docket No. 07010005 V	Section 23D.03.C.3.a(ii)	building mass/width
Docket No. 07010006 V	Section 23D.03.C.3.e(ii)	landscape requirements
Docket No. 07010007 SU	Section 10.02.A	special uses
Docket No. 07010014 V	Section 23D.03.C.3.c.iii(b)	lot coverage over 70%

The site is located at 130 Second St. NW., and is zoned R-4/Residence within the Old Town Overlay – Character Subarea. Filed by Thomas Lazzara for On Track Properties, Inc.

Present for the Petitioner: David Barker, Barker Law Offices. Mr. Lazzara had new drawings that had eliminated a couple of the variance requirements. They will no longer need the lot coverage over 70% (07010014 V). They had garages on the Development Plan, but are now doing underground parking. They will now be 64% coverage. By the removal of the garages, they will now have enough green space to meet the landscape requirements (07010006 V). They have taken an R-4 residential lot with a width of 137 feet and a depth of 165 feet and developed it into 12 flat condominium units. Elevators from the parking garage will serve three floors with four units per floor. They were at TAC on April 18th and the concerns at that time were the landscaping and a sprinkler system for the underground garage. They intend at this point to have sprinklers in the whole project, but would commit to sprinklers in the underground garage. The site is a little over a half acre. It would be an Italianate design with a courtyard. The site would face out to the Monon, taking advantage of the Monon Parkway development. In the packets they had individualized proposed Findings of Fact and supporting information. The maximum building height in the R-4 Old Town Overlay Zone is 30 feet. Because of the parking garage lifting it up to get adequate air flow in the garage, it would be raised to approximately 39 feet. The Italianate design roof pitch will flow with what is in the area and with what is proposed along Main Street and the Monon. The second variance is parking in the front yard. This is a corner lot and technically the side street is considered a front yard. They suggested that what had been done along Main Street with the “duck in” parking would benefit the area by adding additional parking. They would have underground for the residents, but this could be used for visitors. The third variance is the roof pitch variance. The pitch allowed is 812 and proposed is 512. The fourth variance is for the building mass/width. There will be a courtyard with open space and fountains, making it a high-end u-shaped building facing the Monon. It is a 112 feet building/mass width on this parcel. The design is the main requirement for the variance. They felt it added aesthetic value to the building and meets with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan for the area. The last variance is for special uses. Even though multi-family is allowed in R-4 zoning, the Ordinance requires a Special Use for the multi-family unit. They have had discussions with adjacent homeowners and everything to this point has been very positive in comments. Behind this parcel in Old Town Carmel there are alleyways that have not formally been abandoned. In working with the Urban Forester, he recommended they abandon the alleyway behind them for additional green space and buffering. They were willing to commit to undertake getting the alley abandoned and developing additional landscaping. The roof pitch is 412 not 512 as he stated earlier. The units will be 1600 square feet.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor or opposition to the petition.

Opposition:

Hilda Hadley, 140 1st Avenue NW, long time Carmel resident. Her property is on the south side of 2nd Street SW. The Applegate property is on the north side of 2nd Street NW at 2nd Avenue. She would be referring to the western character sub-area bounded by the Monon Greenway, Smokey Row Road, the east side of 1st Avenue NW and 1st Street NW. This has been a preferred place to live for many years and many of the homes have been on the Carmel Clay Historical Society home tours. A map with Ordinance #Z-374-02 shows the character and sub-areas of Carmel Old Town. On page three of the Ordinance it gives the definition of "Contributing Buildings as those that have certain characteristics that are in keeping with historical construction in the Old Town District." The map of Carmel Old Town Contributing Buildings (figure 3) shows approximately 70 buildings in this character sub-area and 50 of those are labeled Contributing. She did not feel a 3-story condominium fits this area. She hoped the Board would respect the Old Town Overlay and keep this sub-area. Mayor Brainard was quoted in the newspaper as saying Carmel should slow down on the building of condos and he recently confirmed that statement. In the Carmel Star, Thursday, March 22, 2007 (in reference to City Center) the Mayor stated "Everyone doesn't want to live in the old suburban community with a house on one acre. This gives them options for people who don't want a cookie-cutter subdivision anymore." She would like to suggest that when these young couples have children they get tired of taking them up and down to parks and they may prefer a backyard. Seniors do not want to be upstairs. Not everyone wants to live in condominiums, apartments or penthouses. She thought there were many who prefer to live in an area like Old Town. Supporting her idea was another article in the Indy Sunday, April 22, 2007. The home of an empty-nester couple was featured. "Both Peggy and David say the extra outside space is one reason they traded in their larger downtown condo for life on a shady street in a smaller home in Chatham Arch near downtown. 'We wanted a backyard and more of a neighborhood feel,' said Peggy Cranfill." You can find that neighborhood feel in Old Town Carmel. She urged the Board to respect the Old Town District Overlay.

Jo Waples, 210 1st Avenue NW, adjoining on the east of the property. They had lived there since 1965 and raised their children in that house. It is an historical house with a large vegetable garden and grape arbor in the back. With this building, her garden will never see the afternoon sun again. She will still be able to sit out on her porch, but she will be looking at the back of the 3-story condos. It will overpower the rest of the houses. She will be sad and wonders what the people walking down the Monon will think when they see this tall building in Old Town. It is a sorry town when a new town takes away all the old that is dear to so many people.

Tom Harris, 131 1st Avenue NW. When renovating the properties they own at 126, 130 and 141 1st Avenue NW, they were careful to stay consistent with the Old Town look. This was done not only because they had to follow the Old Town Overlay guidelines, but also because they enjoy this type of architecture. The proposed Applegate Commons should not even be considered for their neighborhood. The architecture is not only unattractive, but is completely out of character. The density at 24 units per acre, the way he figured it, is six times this area's normal density. The height of the building is unacceptable. To his knowledge there are no three-story buildings in the Old Town Overlay. In an area where parking is very limited, the developer's solution to off-street parking for tenants eliminates 12 on-street parking spaces for downtown shoppers and Monon Trail users. The parking spaces provided with the condos will be used by the residents and others will not be able to use them. His question was why did the BZA, the Plan Commission and the City Council propose and adopt the Old Town Overlay guidelines if anyone with enough resources could come in and change them. He couldn't believe that property tax revenue from this development could be more important than maintaining the integrity of their neighborhood. As far as he could tell the only person who would benefit from this

project is the developer. With almost no support from anyone who actually lives in this neighborhood, please do not allow another unnecessary project to be built.

Bob Diener owns the property on the southeast corner 2nd Street and 2nd Avenue. He used to live in the area. When he built in 1995 there was no Overlay plans and very lenient zoning in that area. He probably could have put in multi-unit townhouses at that time. But he chose to put in two single family attached units because of his desire to keep the area intact as single family small home atmosphere. He was happy the Overlay was going to try to control what was happening in this area. This project completely undermines everything in the Overlay. This was what the Overlay was trying to prevent. The parking in the area is outrageous. With twelve units, you have to assume you will have two people in each unit driving and any guests coming in will be a real problem for any kind of parking. If the Monon users park in the parallel parking on the side, what are the residents going to use?

Off microphone Mr. Lazzara stated there would be 24 to 30 underground parking spaces.

Mr. Diener stated that would take care of the residents if they only had two cars per unit, but what about any guests or owners with three cars? This project with all the variances does not fit into the Overlay plan. They stated they had spoken with adjacent neighbors and there did not seem to have much negative toward it. But here are four that surround the property that have been improving their properties for many years. It just doesn't fit in with the height. It will be ten feet higher than anything around it. We beg that you do not let this go through. As neighbors, this is not something they could approve.

Linus Rude lives at 131 2nd Avenue NW, one lot south. He agreed with the previous speakers. What makes it a neighborhood is what exists now. A monument in the middle of a neighborhood is what is being proposed. It will take away from what we see as Old Town. Looking out their windows to the north, all they would see would be ten or fifteen feet of a building, one lot away with all the trees gone. It doesn't fit.

Dan Logan, 10 Forest Bay Lane, Cicero, Vice President of the Board of Directors of the Carmel/Clay Historical Society. He is opposed to these variances. This three-story, 12-unit complex with its associated traffic and multi-family architecture, would be damaging to the character of Old Town. He grew up in the area and has family members still living there. To grant these variances would be bad enough, but it would set a precedent for future development that has the potential to quickly turn this section of Old Town into a series of grandstand-like buildings fronting the Monon Trail. Like the home strait of the Indianapolis 500, fine in its place, but not in Old Town Carmel. The drive to change Old Town is underway. This is the second meeting he had attended in a week regarding projects counter to the Overlay. As a product of the character of Old Town, he grew up in an era where rules were established and followed. The Zoning Ordinance is a rule and this project does not warrant an exception. Even more important, the Overlay is more than a rule, it is a covenant between the City of Carmel and Old Town residents to retain the unique and irreplaceable character of that area. He implored the Board to observe the covenant. He stated there were people in the audience who were not going to speak. He asked them to raise their hands if they were in opposition. 14+ hands were raised.

Don Fields, 121 1st Avenue NW. The City of Carmel had a committee put together to study and come up with the Old Town Overlay requirements. There were many months spent developing that Overlay. This project is trying to avoid many of those requirements. There are many restrictions in the Overlay,

but to have five variances on one half-acre lot is a little much. The burden of proof is supposed to be a hardship, but he did not see a hardship for the petitioner. He saw a hardship for the neighborhood. He would appreciate the Board rejecting this petition.

David Lipman, 235 1st Avenue NW, one block east of the property. He felt it was too high with too many people and did not meet the character of the neighborhood. He did not have the history of the other remonstrators, but was trying to build a neighborhood feel. He felt it looked like a dorm from the outside. He hoped the Board would reject the petition.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Barker thanked the public for their comments and they were well taken. His office is at 650 N. Range Line and he has a garden in the back. Mr. Lazzara also owns the building with the Chaos Dress Shop, the properties at 221, 231 and 241 W. Main Street, 421 & 431 N. Range Line, and 650 N. Range Line. He has been sensitive to the development and has continued to be a good citizen in development and working with the City of Carmel. He had had four positive telephone calls, but had not had a chance to talk with these remonstrators. He would like to do that. He felt they were improving parking. The residents will be able to park two vehicles underground. The above ground will help places like Bub's and what's going on in the area. This is not a townhome with tenants. This is not what the Mayor was concerned about. This is very high-end project with underground parking and elevators. They are flat units that will be served by the elevators. They will work with landscaping and buffering so that it will not affect the adjacent properties. There is a development close that is this high. He felt it met with the intent of what was going on and some of the properties along the Monon. He felt Mr. Lazzara should talk about what his intentions were in trying to develop this property.

Tom Lazzara, trying to be the owner and developer of this property. He has lived in Carmel since 1972-73 and raised his family here. He is concerned about maintaining gardens and such downtown. During the time for calls to his office the past two months when the sign was up, he apologized that some of the remonstrators did not get a chance to call him and review the plans. The neighbors to the north did call and he met with them at his office to show them the plans. Mr. Barker had also fielded some calls that related to the project. He knew that folks that had built homes on some of the adjoining streets had done things differently. His goal was to create a project that helped keep people in Old Town Carmel by giving them the ability to continue to work here. That was why he chose the idea of building flats. These are not up and down units with a garage on the first floor and the master bedroom two floors up. The idea in this project is to maintain all the square footage on one floor. It would aid people like him to move from a two-story home to a flat space. He viewed this as a project with potential buyers being older who no longer want to use stairs and want to feel secure in their location. The idea of underground parking, all the square footage on one floor and the capability to walk to the up and coming shops in downtown Carmel is appealing. From the standpoint of height, the requirement is 30 feet and this would be 38 feet. He could use a flat roof and bury the garage more and be close to meeting the height requirement. But he wanted to maintain a look that is compatible with what exists in the areas close to this building. One reason he pushed the front to the Monon area was to have a 55-foot backyard. The sun rises on this building in the morning, so there will be plenty of room to grow gardens. Some of the best trees on this lot are in the back. The attempt to preserve some of these things has been important in the planning. This is not a typical condominium project. It is 12 units, it is not 130 units. The price of ground has gone up in the Overlay District and maybe he has caused some of that by buying a home or two here and there. From his ReMax Offices in Carmel and

Broad Ripple he has watched the values increase greatly. At some point there has to be some relationship between the cost of construction and the cost of the ground.

Public Hearing was closed.

Mrs. Conn gave the Department Report. She pointed out that this project will need to appear before the Plan Commission for a Development Plan (DP) approval and Architecture, Design, Lighting, Landscaping and Signage (ADLS) approval. The Department was going to recommend negative consideration of the two dockets that were just withdrawn. The Department recommended positive consideration of all the other dockets after all questions and concerns were addressed.

Mr. Broach asked about the big evergreen trees he had noticed in the back. Now that the parking issue has changed, was there a landscaping plan on file and would these trees be preserved?

Mr. Lazzara responded there was not a plan on file. There is one excellent tree in the middle, but the others are questionable because of the overgrowth. There is a 10-foot alley that stops at the north end of this property. It does not go all the way through and it is not used.

Mr. Barker stated the alley had come up at TAC and they had made a commitment to go through the process to abandon the alley and then come back with a landscape plan for the ADLS.

Mr. Lazzara stated this was two lots. The average lot is roughly 66 by 165, some are narrower. The underground parking will have 24 parking spaces and the engineers have stated they could have up to 30.

Mr. Dierckman asked if they would be willing to table and meet with the public because of all the negative sentiment.

Mr. Barker stated they would be willing to table until the next meeting and talk to the neighbors.

Mr. Dierckman moved to table **Docket Nos. 07010002 V – 07010005 V, 07010007SU, Applegate Condominiums**. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hawkins and **APPROVED 3-0**.

Mr. Broach clarified this would be on the May 21 BZA meeting.

Mr. Dierckman encouraged the public to come to the next meeting for questions from the Board.

Mr. Molitor mentioned that if the additional Board members were present at the next meeting, undoubtedly those members are going to ask both the petitioner and remonstrators to summarize this evening's information.

Mr. Barker stated they would consent to re-open the Public Hearing for the other members.

Mr. Dierckman felt the things the petitioner should focus on were the building height and the rear of the property, maybe some elevation changes. He knew the Plan Commission would be looking at the project very closely because of the Overlay. A lot of people had worked on the Overlay and it is an important document for the area.

Mr. Hawkins asked to see a current picture of the property.

Mr. Lazzara stated it was a concrete block house that had probably been there since the 1950's. He would have a landscape plan after the discussion with the neighbors.

Mr. Hawkins informed the public that the Board is not a precedent-setting body. So regardless of what happens with one petition that does not open it up for other petitions automatically throughout the neighborhood.

8-10h. TABLED: West Carmel Shoppes - Signage

~~The applicant seeks the following development standards variance approval:~~

~~Docket No. 06120007 V Section 25.07 Sign Chart B sign height~~

~~Docket No. 06120008 V Section 25.07.01.04 off-premise sign~~

~~Docket No. 06120009 V Sections 25.07.01.08, 25.07.02.09 number of signs~~

~~The site is located at southeast corner of 106th St and US 421 is zoned B-3/Business and within the US 421 Overlay. Filed by Paul Reis of Bose McKinney & Evans, LLP.~~

21-22h. Hamilton Beverage

The applicant seeks the following development standards variance approvals:

Docket No. 07020025 V Section 25.07.02-08.c maximum sign square footage

Docket No. 07020026 V Section 25.07.02-08.b sign oriented east

The site is located at 2290 E. 116th St. and is zoned B-8/Business.

Filed by Mary Solada of Bingham McHale, LLP for United Package Liquors.

Present for the Petitioner: Mary Solada, Bingham McHale. Also present was Brad Rider, President of United Package Liquors. A picture of the building was shown. United Package Liquors bought Hamilton Beverage in September 2006. It is along heavily traveled 116th Street, west and in front of the Marsh Store. In renovating the store, the building and the signage will be updated. The proposed sign is no larger than the current sign. The Verizon tenant will be leaving the building and United Package Liquors has taken over the entire building. Signage on the east elevation will be smaller. At Special Studies committee on March 29, the façade improvements, including a new door and awnings were approved. (Mr. Rider made comments about the improvements off microphone.) The overall impression of the business will be improved by removing window signs and stacked boxes, etc. Part of the approval by the Special Studies committee was removing the newspaper boxes on the east elevation, reducing the number of vending machines to two, enclosing the dumpster and removing window signage. They feel the new signage will be an improvement for the building. The current 116th Street signage is 95 square feet that has been legally established since the 1970's. The Staff Report talks about a proposed sign that is 108+ square feet. However, they are proposing a sign of 95 square feet which is what is there now. She felt the sign looked smaller because it also included the logo in the square footage. Visually it seemed less intensive and the Verizon sign will be gone. A picture of the sign on the Geist store was in the packets. On the east elevation they are proposing a 50.67 square foot sign which is 37 square feet less than the current sign. The long 116th Street frontage commands more signage than the east end of the building. They are working to upgrade the appearance, business and image which are good for the 116th Street corridor. If the variances are denied, there is no incentive to remove the existing sign and to spend the money for the upgrades. They have a letter of support from Merchants' Plaza which is the owner of the shops near this location.

Members of the public were invited to speak in favor or opposition to the petition.

Opposition:

Jack Badger, 3039 Rolling Springs Drive. He commended the owners for improving what had been a real eyesore. He questioned any hardship for any sign or any number of signs for United Package Liquors at 116th Street. It is a very prominent location in the City. He thought if the business changed ownership then all the signs should revert back to the current Sign Ordinance standards. For the six months they had been the owners of the business, they had been in violation of the trash storage units. Pictures were shown. The trash containers set wherever the trash truck drops them. The City Ordinance requires them to be enclosed. One of them had been taken care of, but the two owned by Verizon were still uncontained. If this sign received a variance in 1976, he hoped the Department had taken a measurement of the actual sign. If they were given a variance at that time, he felt it should revert back to the Ordinance size. Based upon the location along 116th Street, he did not feel United Package Liquors could demonstrate any hardship for signage. He felt they should be held within the standards of the Sign Ordinance.

The Public Hearing was closed.

Rebuttal:

Ms. Solada clarified that hardship is not a required finding because this is not a variance of use. With a sign variance there are only three findings: 1) that the approval of the variance will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals or general welfare; 2) the use and value of adjacent property will not be affected; 3) strict application of the Zoning Ordinance will result in practical difficulties. In terms of #1, they do not think this approval will be injurious to the public health, safety, morals or general welfare because in their estimation it has an appearance of being less intensive. The bird logo has been moved to the left of the sign. The same with use and value of adjacent properties; they thought there was a need for the community to be aware of new ownership of the business. They are trying to re-brand this location as being under new management and ownership. It will have the same branding as their other locations in Marion County. At this point there are no code enforcement violations.

Mrs. Conn gave the Department Report. The Department recommended favorable consideration of the sign oriented east. However, the Department recommended negative consideration of the sign square footage. From Tab 4 in the packet, the building is only about 60 feet from the road right-of-way. They are proposing a 108 square foot sign. (Ms. Solada clarified it is now amended to 95 square feet.) The Marsh sign which sets about 537 feet from the right-of-way is approximately 150 square feet. The Sign Ordinance permits 45 square feet. Upon research for sign permits for this site, a 1996 sign permit showed there was to be a face change to a sign at 54 square feet. Therefore, the Department recommended negative consideration to the sign square footage.

Mr. Dierckman asked where they were in the process of making changes to the building because it is an eyesore.

Mr. Rider stated they have not started. Besides the signage, they have already reduced the vending machines to two and removed the paper machines. When Verizon leaves in June, two of the dumpsters will go away. The dumpster on the east side will move to the west side and be enclosed. They are going to move the door to be centered on the building, remove Verizon's door, replace some of the

front with windows and remodel the interior of the building. All the boxes and posters will be removed and there will be a clear view into the building. The outside color will be up to Fineberg, the owner.

Mr. Dierckman asked if the eagle was putting them over the size allowed and if it was a logo for United Package and why did they want to keep Hamilton Beverage on the sign?

Mr. Rider stated the eagle is their logo and they kept the name Hamilton Beverage because of its long history in Carmel. When they bought the company they gave their word they would keep the name.

Mr. Dierckman did not like the eagle and size of the sign, but wondered if there were any plans to hide the rooftop equipment. Could they agree to do that to clean it up?

Mr. Rider did not know what the equipment was, but would commit to enclose it.

Mr. Dierckman did not feel the eagle would compel anyone to come into the store. If they eliminated the eagle, the size would be manageable.

Mr. Rider would rather reduce the sign a little more than give up the eagle, because it does brand their company. They also own stores in Brownsburg call the Toddy Shops as well as United Package Liquor and United Fine Wine & Spirits and all of them have the eagle. It is a family of beverage shops with different names, but the eagle keeps it familiar.

Mrs. Conn stated about 50 square feet would be allowed under the current Sign Ordinance.

Ms. Solada felt 45 square feet was too small, but maybe they could do less than 95 square feet.

Discussion followed on the size of the sign and various options.

Mrs. Conn thought 75 square feet would be an improvement for the Department to look upon more favorably. At the Plan Commission Sub-committee it will be reviewed for colors and the Department will probably recommend that the sign become entirely white.

Mr. Hawkins asked if they were currently in violation.

Mrs. Conn stated the Department thought someone probably dropped the ball in 1996 and never followed up to see if they erected the correct sign size. Technically the sign could be considered grandfathered.

More discussion followed regarding the size of the bird in the signage. It is approximately 25 percent

Mr. Hawkins asked if they would be on any of Merchants' Square signage.

Ms. Solada stated they are not part of the Merchants' Square sign program.

Mr. Hawkins felt it should be tabled until they could see a scale of the sign, maybe even different sizes. He thought the sign might be too small for the mansard roof. He would hate to see a big building with a small sign stuck in the center. He wanted to see some kind of scale.

Ms. Solada asked if they could be placed on next month's agenda as the first item in Old Business.

Mr. Hawkins moved to table **Docket Nos. 07020025 V & 07020026 V, Hamilton Beverage** to the May 21 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dierckman and **APPROVED 3-0**.

Mr. Rider will bring renderings of the sign and building improvements.

23-31h. TABLED: Merchants' Square - Signage

~~The applicant seeks the following development standards variance approval:~~

Docket No. 07020030 V	Section 25.07.02-09.b	number of monument signs
Docket No. 07020031 V	Section 25.07.02-09.b	all tenants not on sign
Docket No. 07020032 V	Section 25.07 Sign Chart A	sign height
Docket No. 07020033 V	Section 25.07 Sign Chart A	square feet, monument sign
Docket No. 07020034 V	Section 25.07.02-11.b	number of directory signs
Docket No. 07020035 V	Section 25.07.01.04	off-premise sign
Docket No. 07020036 V	Section 25.07.01.04	off-premise sign
Docket No. 07020037 V	Section 25.07 Sign Chart A	setback
Docket No. 07020038 V	Section 25.07 Sign Chart A	setback

~~The site is located at 2160 Keystone Way and is zoned B-8/Business.~~

~~Filed by Amanda Gates of Sign Craft Industries.~~

11-15h. TABLED: The Corner – Signs

~~The applicant seeks the following development standards variance approvals:~~

Docket No. 07030021 V	Section 23F.13.01.A	ground sign prohibited in overlay
Docket No. 07030022 V	Section 25.07.02-9.b	total number of signs
Docket No. 07030023 V	Section 25.07.02-9.b	number of tenants shown on ground sign
Docket No. 07030024 V	Section 25.07.02-9.d	ground sign height
Docket No. 07030025 V	Section 25.07.02-10.e	location within proposed road right of way

~~The site is located at the southwest corner of 116th St. & Range Line Rd. The site is zoned B-3/Business within the Carmel Dr – Range Line Rd Overlay.~~

~~Filed by Paul Reis of Bose McKinney & Evans LLP.~~

16-18h. Pinnacle Pointe – Signs

~~The applicant seeks the following development standards variance approvals:~~

Docket No. 07030018 V	Section 25.07.02-10.b	signs oriented south
Docket No. 07030019 V	Section 25.07.02-10.b	total number of signs
Docket No. 07030020 V	Section 25.07.02-10.b	sign types

~~The site is located at 12065 Old Meridian St. and is zoned B-6/Business within the US 31 Overlay.~~

~~Filed by Nancy Long of A-1 Expeditors, Inc.~~

The Petitioner was not present.

Mr. Dierckman moved to table **Docket Nos. 07030018 V – 07030020 V, Pinnacle Pointe – Signs**. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hawkins and **APPROVED 3-0**. These items were **TABLED** to the May 21, 2007 meeting.

I. Old Business

There was no Old Business.

J. New Business

There was no New Business.

K. Adjournment

Mr. Broach moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dierckman and **APPROVED 3-0**.
The meeting adjourned at 7:25 PM.

James R. Hawkins, President

Connie Tingley, Secretary